

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-111 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 6, 18, 19, 28, 29, 37, 38, 40, 45, 57, 58, 67, 68, 76, 81, 93, 94, 103, and 104 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-111 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,567,980 to Jain et al. (hereinafter “Jain”). Claims 3, 6-7, 9-12, 18-36, 38-39, 42, 45-56, 48-51, 57-75, 78, 81-82, 84-87 and 93-111 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Jain.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Jain teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “displaying a first lens moveable over representations of multimedia information displayed in the GUI in response to user input, the first lens covering a first portion of the first area.” Jain fails to disclose the above recited feature. Jain merely shows a GUI that includes panel 172 with a preview window

showing the live video being digitized. The preview window element of Jain is substantially different from the first lens recited in amended claim 1. Jain fails to teach or suggest that the GUI elements of Jain such as the preview window are moveable in response to use input over representations of multimedia information displayed in the GUI as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain fails to teach or suggest the above recited feature. Jain further fails to teach or suggest the feature of “displaying, in a second area of the GUI, a representation of multimedia information displayed in the first portion of the first area, the representation of multimedia information displayed in the second area comprising a portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the first lens and a portion of the representation of information of the second type covered by the first lens.” The video displayed in the preview window of Jain is the end result of the capture process, not the location, mechanism, or means where capture occurs. Jain thus fails to provide any active correlation between the act of displaying frames in the preview window and the act of displaying information in the other portions of the GUI. The capture process of Jain causes the video to be displayed in the preview window and the other information on the other areas of Jain. Jain fails to teach or suggest that covering the video shown in the preview window displays, in a second area of the GUI, a representation of multimedia information displayed in the first portion of the first area, the representation of multimedia information displayed in the second area comprising a portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the first lens and a portion of the representation of information of the second type covered by the first lens as recited in claim 1 because of the passive nature of the preview window in Jain is to merely display video from the capture process.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

### **Claims 2-111**

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 18, 28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 57, 67, 76, 93, and 103 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the

allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-17, 19-27, 29-36, 41-56, 58-66, 68-75, 77-92, 94-102, and 104-111 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 18, 28, 40, 57, 67, 76, 93, and 103 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons, some of which are discussed below.

Applicants further request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 3, 6-7, 9-12, 18-36, 38-39, 42, 45-56, 48-51, 57-75, 78, 81-82, 84-87 and 93-111 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments are made to expedite issuance of the allowable subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

## **Claim 2**

Claims 2 recites wherein displaying the representation of the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document in the first area of the GUI comprises:

displaying a first thumbnail image in the first area of the GUI, the first thumbnail image comprising the representation of information of the first type; and

displaying a second thumbnail image in the first area of the GUI, the second thumbnail image comprising the representation of information of the second type. (Emphasis added).

The Office Action alleges that the panel 176 of Jain discloses displaying a first thumbnail image in the first area of the GUI, the first thumbnail image comprising the representation of information of the first type (e.g., video). The Office Action further alleges that Col. 4, lines 20-65 of Jain disclose displaying a second thumbnail image in the first area of

the GUI, the second thumbnail image comprising the representation of information of the second type. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office Action has failed to identify where in Col. 4, lines 20-65 Jain discloses displaying a second thumbnail image in the first area of the GUI, the second thumbnail image comprising the representation of information of the second type thumbnail image. The Office Action associates “caption text” of Jain as allegedly being equivalent to information of the second type recited in claim 1. However, Jain fails to teach or suggest displaying a thumbnail image of “caption text” in panel 176. The actual caption text is displayed in Jain in panel 178 which is not the same area the Office Action alleges as a thumbnail image of the video is displayed. Moreover, Jain fails to teach or suggest displaying a thumbnail representation of information of the second type as recited in claim 1 because there is no thumbnail representation in Jain of the caption text.

Thus, Jain fails to teach or suggest displaying a first thumbnail image in the first area of the GUI and displaying a second thumbnail image in the first area of the GUI as recited in claim 2. Therefore, Jain fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in claim 2.

### **Claim 6**

Amended claim 6 recites in part the feature of “displaying a second lens moveable in response to user input over representations of multimedia information displayed in the GUI, the second lens covering a first portion of the second area.” The Office Action merely alleges that Jain clearly fails to teach the third area recited in claim 6, but that it was well known to display a third area in the GUI. However, the Office Action fails to identify where Jain discloses the second lens.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain fails to teach or suggest the second lens moveable in response to user input over representations of multimedia information displayed in the GUI as recited in amended claim 6, such that, in a third area of the GUI, a representation of multimedia information corresponding to the first portion of the second area is displayed, the representation of multimedia information displayed in the third area comprising a

portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the second lens and a portion of the representation of information of the second type covered by the second lens.

Thus, Jain fails to teach or suggest displaying second lens as recited in amended claim 6. Therefore, Jain fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in amended claim 6.

**Claim 20**

Claim 20 recites the feature of “changing the position of the first lens in response to user input such that the first lens emphasizes a portion of the first area of the GUI.” The Office Action merely acknowledges that Jain fails to teach a fifth and sixth time. The Office Action fails to identify where position of the preview window of Jain is changed in response to user input as recited in claim 20.

Thus, Jain fails to teach or suggest a first lens as recited in claim 20, Therefore, Jain fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in amended claim 20.

Appl. No. 10/081,129  
Amdt. dated February 11, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2007

PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61276803 v1